

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action of September 8, 2010 in which claims 18-31 were rejected.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 18-31, it is believed that the Examiner intended to reject independent claims 18 and 31 and the dependent claims 19-22 of claim 31. The dependent claims 23-30 are dependent from allowed claim 17.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 18 and 31, the Applicant has chosen to re-introduce the limitation that the first and second communication devices are capable of communicating with the telecommunications network. According to the Applicant's understanding of the secondary reference (US 2002/0099772), a synchronization between a mobile and a server is done (see Fig. 4A, paragraphs [0029]-[0031]) and the server has no connection to a telecommunications network.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of September 8, 2010, having been obviated by amendment, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 18-31 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Francis J. Maguire/

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/lk
Customer Number: 4955
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
(203) 261-1234